

### **Remarks**

Claims 1-9 were pending in the application. Claims 6-9 have been withdrawn and canceled as being drawn to a non-elected embodiment. By this amendment, Applicants have amended Claims 1-5 without introducing new matter. Claims 1-5 remain pending.

### **Elections/Restrictions**

Applicants acknowledge with appreciation that Claim 6-9 have been withdrawn from further consideration in accordance with applicant's election without traverse.

### **35 U.S.C. §112 Claim Rejections**

Claims 1-5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112 as being indefinite. The rejection raised a question of the difference between "depth" and "draw depth". Applicants have amended the claims to make reference only to depth, since that term covers the meaning as it was intended with regard to draw depth and depth. This is essentially the distance from open-end to closed-end or in other words, the wall height.

Claims 1-5 were rejected for their use of "its" and Claims 2 and 3 were rejected for their use of "is such that" the Claims have been rewritten to overcome this rejection and both of the objectionable terms have been deleted.

Claims 1-3 include the limitation "the ratio". Although applicants believe that since there is only one ratio possible from the disclosed depth and opening measurements, the original reference to "the ratio" was proper. However, the claims have been re-written for clarity and reference to the "ratio" has been removed.

Applicants respectfully submit that all claims now satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112.

**35 U.S.C. §102**

Claims 1-3 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C §102(b) as being anticipated by Kitajima '886. Kitajima '886 discloses an open ended polyimide molding. A careful reading of Kitajima '886 clearly indicates that the proposed molding is, in fact, a tube, open at both ends and formed on a mandril. In sharp contrast, the claimed invention is a molding having only one open end, and a closed end, as can be formed from sheet or film material through methods including deep drawing. Independent Claim 1 has been amended to claim a wall defining an opening at one end and a closed end at the other. This is consistent with Applicants' disclosure on page 7 of the original specification, which indicates that "the invention is to obtain open-ended moldings with no closed part, typically including tray shaped, carrier belt shaped or cup container shaped moldings to be produced by deforming or drawing films". Although this sentence states there is "no closed part", this is in relation to the open-end only as clarified by the fact that the invention is contemplated in the form of tray shaped and cup shaped articles, which necessarily have only one open-end. Those skilled in the art will also readily recognize that the deep drawing and drawing techniques use vacuum pressure or mechanical presses to shape an article from a planar film of material. As such, the film is deformed into a shape, and necessarily includes side walls and a closed-end. As an example, the moldings of the invention are applied to, for example, speaker cones or lamp reflectors for cars. A rough sketch of what is contemplated is attached on a

separate sheet for the Examiner's convenience. There is no use that the closed-end is cut to form a tube shape such as disclosed in Kitajima '886. The closed-end may later be cut or punched to form a tube shape. However, this later process is not discussed or claimed by any of Claims 1-5.

Applicants respectfully submit this distinction is significant over the '886 disclosure. Applicants respectfully submit that Kitajima '886 does not teach a polyimide molding having only one open-end. Accordingly, Kitajima '886 does not and cannot anticipate the claimed invention. Withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §102 rejection is respectfully requested.

### **35 U.S.C. §103**

Claims 4 and 5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over the hypothetical combination of Kitajima '886 in view of Yamamoto '507 and in further view of Yamamoto '996.

Yamamoto '507 is cited as teaching a thermoplastic aromatic polyimide while Yamamoto '996 is cited for its teaching of a degree of elongation at break. Neither of these references, alone or in combination, overcomes the deficiency of Kitajima '886 as discussed in relation to the 35 U.S.C. §102 rejection above. Applicants respectfully submit that the hypothetical combination does not teach or suggest the invention as claimed, and in particular it does not teach or suggest a polyimide molding having only one open-end.

In light of these significant distinctions, applicants respectfully submit that all pending claims are now in condition for allowance over the cited references.

Accordingly, early reconsideration and an allowance of all pending claims is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



T. Daniel Christenbury  
Reg. No. 31,750  
Attorney for the Applicants

TDC/MAP:kb  
(215) 563-1810